

REMARKS

The only issues outstanding in the Office Action mailed September 24, 2008, are the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 101, 112 and 103. Reconsideration of these issues, in view of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 101

Claims 7-11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, as a result of the “use” terminology. The claims have been reformatted as method claims, in a form more usual for U.S. practice, and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested. It is noted that the scope of these claims has not been changed, either literally or for purposes of the Doctrine of Equivalents, by these amendments.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 2, 4 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested. The preferable or “advantageous” recitations have been removed from these claims, as is required in U.S. practice. It is noted that the scope of these claims has not been changed either literally, or for purposes of the Doctrine of Equivalents, by these amendments. Reconsideration of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Bulow ‘003 taken with Kanazireve ‘340. Reconsideration of this rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action cites Bulow for its teaching of the removal of carbon dioxide from a gas stream by passing the gas stream through natural or synthetic clinoptilolite. The Office Action acknowledges that Bulow does not disclose the use of zeolite A, X, Y or chabazite. However, the Office Action argues that the combination of such zeolite with the clinoptilolite of Bulow would be obvious in view of Kanazireve, which discloses an absorbent containing a

zeolite, alumina and a metal component, used to purify an air stream to remove water, carbon dioxide and hydrocarbons. It is argued, at page 4 of the Office Action, that although the data in the examples of the present specification has been carefully considered, no synergistic effect from the use of the mixture is seen, and that, consequently, the use of the combination provides merely additive results. Applicants respectfully disagree with this analysis. In table 3, at page 9 of the specification, the ability to eliminate COS during the drying of a natural gas containing both H₂S and CO₂ is shown for seven zeolites. The first three zeolites are comparative, NK 30 contains zeolite A, AW500 and CHA-I each contain only chabazites. The four following zeolites in the table CHA-a, b, c, and d each contain a mixture of chabazite and clinoptilite. The ability of the zeolites in accordance with the invention to absorb COS is substantially, unexpectedly approved over zeolite A or chabazite, alone. It is respectfully submitted that such is clearly evidence of unexpected results, and probative of non-obviousness. Withdrawal of the rejection is therefore respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees associated with this response or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 13-3402.

Respectfully submitted,

/Harry B. Shubin/

Harry B. Shubin, Reg. No. 32,004
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)

MILLEN, WHITE, ZELANO
& BRANIGAN, P.C.
Arlington Courthouse Plaza 1, Suite 1400
2200 Clarendon Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22201
Telephone: (703) 243-6333
Facsimile: (703) 243-6410

Attorney Docket No.: ATOCM-0357

Date: February 24, 2009